

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application; claims 17-20 are newly added.

The applicants respectfully request the Examiner to acknowledge the claim for priority and receipt of certified copies of all the priority document(s), and to state whether the drawings are acceptable.

Claims are amended for non-statutory reasons: to correct one or more informalities, remove figure label number(s), and/or to replace European-style claim phraseology with American-style claim language. The claims are not narrowed in scope and no new matter is added.

The Office action rejects claims 1 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Adamson (USP 6,400,103) and Marsden et al. (USPA 2002/0173321, hereinafter Marsden). The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Neither Adamson nor Marsden discloses a lighting control network recovery system that includes ballasts that are configurable as either a slave element or a master control unit, and specifically, neither Adamson nor Marsden discloses a network of slave ballasts that are controlled by a ballast that is configured as a network master control unit, wherein if the network master control unit becomes inoperative, one of the slave ballasts is reconfigured to be the new network master control unit.

The Office action acknowledges that Adamson fails to teach that when the network master control unit becomes inoperative, one of the slave ballasts is reconfigured to be the new network master control unit, and asserts that Marsden provides this teaching. The applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion. Marsden does not address recovering from a failure of a network master control unit, and cannot be said to teach reconfiguring a slave ballast to become the master control unit, as claimed by the applicants.

The Office action asserts that because Marsden's ballasts have a unique address and the network is enabled to change dynamically to take into account nodes joining or leaving the network, it would be obvious to form a combination of Marsden and Adamson. Whether this assertion is correct or not, the Office action fails to explain how this combination would lead to the applicants' claimed invention, and the applicants respectfully maintain that such a combination cannot be said to lead to the applicants' invention, because neither Marsden nor Adamson teaches a process for dealing with a failure of the master control unit.

Marsden specifically addresses the joining and leaving of slave nodes to and from the network:

"Each *slave* node has a unique address. If the network includes an address server then on installation, the user could request that the unique address be replaced by a more user friendly unique radio address which can be shorter and will therefore be more economical to transmit.

"In order to enable the network to change dynamically to take in account *slave* nodes, such as street lamps, joining or leaving the network, various options are possible." (Marsden [0025]-[0026], italics added.)

Both Adamson and Marsden are silent with respect to a leaving of the master node from the network, and the Office action fails to identify where either Marsden or Adamson provides a teaching of a network wherein, if the ballast that is configured as the network master control unit becomes inoperative, a slave ballast is reconfigured to be the new network master control unit, as specifically claimed in each of claim 1 and 9. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully maintain that the rejection of claims 1 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Adamson and Marsden is unfounded, and should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection(s) and/or rejection(s) of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert M. McDermott/
Robert M. McDermott, Esq.
Reg. 41,508
804-493-0707

Please direct all correspondence to:

Corporate Counsel
U.S. PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001